



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,338	11/06/2001	Thanh V. Lam	POU901015US1	6039

46369 7590 12/22/2005

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.  
5 COLUMBIA CIRCLE  
ALBANY, NY 12203

EXAMINER

CANGIALOSI, SALVATORE A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/992,338

Applicant(s)

LAM ET AL.

Examiner

Salvatore Cangialosi

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/12/2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,30,32-39 and 63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,30,32-39 and 63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 3621

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

2. Claims 1, 3-10, 30, 32-40 & 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Archibold (6604124) or Boucher et al (6976007) in view of Freund (6076174).

Regarding claim 1, both Archibold (See abstract, Fig. 1, Cols. 3 and 4) or Boucher et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 3, 4-7, Col. 2, lines 40-65, Col. 3, lines 10-55, Col. 7, lines 10-65, claims 1-15) disclose a method for employing distributed processing and tracking of jobs (either electronic scribes or package delivery) by user queries of collected information substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific terminology. It is noted that it is believed that the disclosed trackings are functionally equivalent to the claimed limitations. Freund (See

Art Unit: 3621

Fig. 2, Col. 3, lines 25-40, col. 4, lines 25-50) show performance characteristics of a job in real time. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Archibold or Boucher et al because it is standard practice to monitor performance characteristics of tracked objects for a user. Regarding the list limitations of claim 3, both Archibold (See abstract, Fig. 1, Cols. 3 and 4) or Boucher et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 3, 4-7, Col. 2, lines 40-65, Col. 3, lines 10-55, Col. 7, lines 10-65, claims 1-15) disclose a method for employing distributed processing and tracking of jobs (either electronic scribes or package delivery) by user queries of collected information which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations because performance measures require predefined rating levels. Regarding the limitations of claims 4-10, both Archibold (See abstract, Fig. 1, Cols. 3 and 4) or Boucher et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 3, 4-7, Col. 2, lines 40-65, Col. 3, lines 10-55, Col. 7, lines 10-65, claims 1-15) disclose a method for employing distributed processing and tracking of jobs (either electronic scribes or package delivery) by user queries of collected information which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 30, both Archibold (See abstract, Fig. 1, Cols. 3 and 4) or Boucher et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 3, 4-7, Col. 2, lines 40-65, Col. 3, lines 10-55, Col. 7, lines 10-65, claims 1-15) disclose a means for employing distributed processing and tracking of jobs

Art Unit: 3621

(either electronic scribes or package delivery) by user queries of collected information substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific terminology. It is noted that it is believed that the disclosed trackings are functionally equivalent to the claimed limitations. Freund (See Fig. 2, Col. 3, lines 25-40, col. 4, lines 25-50) show performance characteristics of a job in real time. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Archibold or Boucher et al because it is standard practice to monitor performance characteristics of tracked objects for a user. Regarding the list limitations of claim 32, both Archibold (See abstract, Fig. 1, Cols. 3 and 4) or Boucher et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 3, 4-7, Col. 2, lines 40-65, Col. 3, lines 10-55, Col. 7, lines 10-65, claims 1-15) disclose a means for employing distributed processing and tracking of jobs (either electronic scribes or package delivery) by user queries of collected information which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations because performance measures require predefined rating levels. Regarding the limitations of claims 33-39, both Archibold (See abstract, Fig. 1, Cols. 3 and 4) or Boucher et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 3, 4-7, Col. 2, lines 40-65, Col. 3, lines 10-55, Col. 7, lines 10-65, claims 1-15) disclose a means for employing distributed processing and tracking of jobs (either electronic scribes or package delivery) by user queries of

Art Unit: 3621

collected information which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 63, both Archibold (See abstract, Fig. 1, Cols. 3 and 4) or Boucher et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 3, 4-7, Col. 2, lines 40-65, Col. 3, lines 10-55, Col. 7, lines 10-65, claims 1-15) disclose a digital means for employing distributed processing and tracking of jobs (either electronic scribes or package delivery) by user queries of collected information substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific terminology. It is noted that it is believed that the disclosed trackings are functionally equivalent to the claimed limitations.

Freund (See Fig. 2, Col. 3, lines 25-40, col. 4, lines 25-50) show performance characteristics of a job in real time. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Archibold or Boucher et al because it is standard practice to monitor performance characteristics of tracked objects for a user.

**Examiner's Note:** Although Examiner has cited particular columns, line numbers and figures in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant(s), the specified citations are merely representative of the teaching of the prior art that are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim and other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the applicant(s), in preparing the response, fully consider the items of evidence in

Serial Number: 09/992,338

6

Art Unit: 3621

their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Salvatore Cangialosi at telephone number **(571) 272-6927**. The examiner can normally be reached 6:30 Am to 5:00 PM, Tuesday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell, can be reached at **(571) 272-6712**.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**or faxed to (571)272-8300**

Hand delivered responses should be brought to


United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Serial Number: 09/992,338

7

Art Unit: 3621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
SALVATORE CANGIALOSI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 222